

That is making them absorb inflationary increases, additional workload. That is tough, but that is doable.

But take a look at what happens to this spending when CBO implements its cuts. It drops from over \$850 million down to just below \$700 million, just above \$650 million, by the year 2000. This is, I would say, about a 30 percent cut in the Food and Drug Administration. That is 25 percent. This is in the body that is supposed to keep our food supply safe and make sure we get good quality, reliable, efficacious drugs. That is something I challenge. Can we afford to cut the FDA that much? I do not think so.

Let us take another one. This one is very important. We are talking about the research that is done to deal with diseases and promoting cures for many of the diseases we have and the things that are of great concern to many people—the National Institutes of Health.

The President starts off with a nice little increase, but you can see by the year 2000, that has to fall off the table. That is almost a \$2 billion cut in the budget of NIH to reach balance by the year 2002. Overall it is a 14 percent cut. Are we not going to need the research done by the National Institutes of Health in the year 2001 and 2002? I think we will. I am optimistic that we are going to discover cures. But I do not think we are going to make all the progress we can possibly make and then be able to shut down research at NIH. So I question the priority of slashing the NIH budget.

How about some of the other priorities? I have a responsibility for acting on, in our appropriations subcommittee, the budget for EPA. You all have heard a great deal about the President and his support for EPA. Who would have believed just a few months ago that the President's budget would leave EPA with less money 6 years from now than it got from Congress last year, and well below the budget proposal we are presenting this year? As I have said many times over, numbers do not lie.

This is what happens to funding under our Senate-passed budget resolution. We hold EPA at a flat line. We want to work to improve the way that EPA does its business. We think that there are new ideas that are being developed both within EPA and by groups supporting EPA that can give us tremendous progress as we shift more responsibilities to State and local governments and maintain a vitally important monitoring function at the national level and using more flexible means of achieving goals.

The President said it well in his budget: "If industry can come up with a better way, a cheaper way of doing it, let's do it the most effective way." We can live with it. But take a look at what happens to the President's budget under the numbers presented by the President and as scored by CBO. This EPA budget takes a very sharp drop from just above \$7.2 billion to below \$6.4 billion by the year 2002.

This is a tremendous slash for the environment. He said, I thought, in his message in here that one of his priorities is making sure we take care of the environment. I do not think his budget does that. He says, "We need to invest in education, training, the environment, science and technology." I think our budget does a lot better job of doing that than his does.

Oh, yeah, by the way, science and technology. Our subcommittee also finances the National Science Foundation. We provide funding for it. Look what happens to the funding in the National Science Foundation. The Senate budget includes a slow but steady upward path. The President's budget gives us a little bump up here and then it drops off the table again because it has to. The President himself ordered that cuts be made to bring the budget in balance in the year 2002. Under CBO scoring that is the only way it is going to get to balance.

Finally, I addressed yesterday the budget of the Veterans' Administration, the agency which provides care to the medically indigent veterans and those veterans who have been injured in the service of their country, a very, very important group of people who depend solely on the Veterans' Administration.

These people would see the money devoted to their health care cut by almost 25 percent. The Clinton budget cuts \$12.9 billion out of the VA budget by the year 2002. We maintain essentially level funding. That is a cut that the veterans of this country cannot live with, and we in good conscience cannot live with.

I mentioned to this body yesterday that the President's people have said, "Don't believe these numbers." The Secretary of the Veterans' Administration, Jesse Brown, when he testified before my subcommittee, said, "The President has assured me that these will not be the numbers. He is going to negotiate with us." A representative of the White House Office of Management and Budget was quoted in the papers in our home State saying these numbers that are being presented, we are misrepresenting, because we took the numbers out of the book and out of the CBO. He said, "Those are just rough general guidelines. Don't believe them."

So it is the official policy of the administration not to believe the official policy. Until they send us up new numbers, send us a new budget, that is what we have to work with. That is what the priorities are: Cutting veterans, cutting national science, EPA, NIH.

Mr. President, that is not the way to get to the balanced budget we need. We can do so by following the plan outlined by Chairman DOMENICI. I urge all my colleagues to look at the contrasting numbers and make up their mind. I hope they will support the budget supported by the Senate Budget Committee.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 3:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:30 p.m., recessed until 3:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. KEMPTHORNE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BOB DOLE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I just had the opportunity to listen to the majority leader make his announcement of his future. I wanted to come to the floor this afternoon to salute BOB DOLE's 35 years of dedication to this institution and to his country. No one has given more, and no one has greater admiration in this body than does BOB DOLE.

I congratulate him on his decision. I believe it was the right one. Obviously, it is never easy to leave this institution. But he does so with our good wishes. While we will have the opportunity to serve with BOB DOLE for at least the next several weeks, we wish BOB, his wife Elizabeth, and his daughter, Robin, well as they pursue their future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of the quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, as a matter of fairness, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SENATOR DOLE'S ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I just watched Senator DOLE make his announcement. I want to join with Senator DASCHLE in his comments. I have worked with BOB DOLE from my days in the House and have come to have great respect for the huge contribution he has made here in the Senate and to our country. I think sometimes we get so partisan here that we forget the contributions that people are making.

Let me add one other thing, because media coverage is so negative all the

time on candidates and officeholders that I think one thing is ignored, which is that we have a good choice between two outstanding candidates for President in Bill Clinton and BOB DOLE. For philosophical reasons, because of who might be appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and that type of thing, I am supporting Bill Clinton. But I am not going to buy a one-way ticket to Canada if BOB DOLE gets elected. I think the American people have a choice between two very fine, substantial candidates. That is the way our system should work.

In all the negatives that people will hear between now and November 5, the American people should not lose sight of that.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution. Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield whatever time is needed off of our time to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the committee and of the ranking member of the committee. I just want to say at the outset what an outstanding job I think the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Senator EXON, has done with respect to the budget that we are now considering. I was privileged to be very supportive of his position in the committee, and continue to be so. I want to thank him for the leadership that he provided on our side of the aisle.

Mr. President, I want to take just a moment or two to sound what may be an alarm bell in the night and take what is perceived as not the most popular position. But I want to talk a little bit about the 150 account—that is the international affairs account in this budget—and to simply sound a warning that I think we have been reducing that 150 account in successive years in such a way that we are now impeding upon our ability to perform as a great power in the world.

The budget that is before us and that has been brought out of committee would cut the international affairs portion of the budget by more than \$1 billion from the President's request. The President requested \$19.2 billion, and the bill reported from the committee cuts it to \$18.1 billion.

The actual international affairs spending in this particular account in the budget, which covers all of our responsibilities abroad other than the military, was \$20.8 billion in fiscal year 1994, and \$20.1 billion in fiscal year 1995. It is estimated at \$18.5 billion for fiscal year 1996. So we are making a very significant cut from historical levels.

In other words, international affairs spending has been brought down from \$20.8 billion in fiscal year 1994 to \$18.1 billion in fiscal year 1997, which is a cut of almost \$3 billion just in that short period of time. That represents a cut of about 15 percent in the budget that we have to carry out our responsibilities internationally.

In fact, our international affairs budget has been reduced by 50 percent in real terms over the last decade. In other words, if you adjust for inflation and take a 10-year period, we, in effect, are cutting by 50 percent our ability to carry out programs in the international arena. We are in the process now of asking the international affairs budget to do more and are providing less with which it can be done.

During the 1980's, we did not have democratic, market-oriented regimes in Eastern Europe. At that time we were building nuclear weapons instead of trying to help the Russians destroy and dismantle them. We had one Embassy to cover a country, the Soviet Union, where we now have 15 separate countries. At that time neither Jordan nor the Palestinians recognized Israel's right to exist, so we had no stake in their economic vitality. We had economic sanctions against South Africa; now we are trying to help South Africa rebuild. All of these are new responsibilities and opportunities over the last few years.

So, in fact, our responsibilities increased rather than diminished, and particularly if the arena of competition or concern shifts from the military into the political and economic arena.

Only about 1 percent of the Federal budget is spent on foreign aid, and less than half of that goes to humanitarian and development programs. In fact, the United States ranks dead last among 21 industrialized members of the OECD in the percentage of GNP that we spend on development assistance. All of these other countries have made the judgment that they have an important interest in helping the rest of the world to develop; so much so that they are prepared to commit a larger percentage of their GNP than we are to development assistance.

I know these are not popular facts to bring before the country, but I think it is important for those of us who carry the responsibility which comes with being Members of the U.S. Senate to stop and consider it because we have to square the rhetoric about being the world's leader with the reality of how that is accomplished.

In fact, there is, apparently, a great deal of misconception across the coun-

try. A nationwide poll done last January by the University of Maryland found that a majority of Americans, when asked what percentage of the budget they think is spent on foreign assistance said 15 percent or higher. The majority said 15 percent or higher. When they were asked how much they thought should be spent, they said on average about 5 percent. In fact, we spend about 1 percent. There is a tremendous disparity in perception. The majority think we spend more than 15 percent of our budget for this purpose when we in fact spend about 1 percent.

I am very frank to say to my colleagues that if the United States is going to continue to be a great power, we have to commit the resources to carry out our responsibilities as a great power. This is particularly true in the post-cold-war era, when a range of complex problems faces us. That means coming up with adequate funding for the conduct of our foreign affairs. In my view, we have already cut well below the minimum level that is necessary to sustain American leadership in the world.

I really want to sound that warning. I am persuaded that over time, if this trend continues, it will become obvious to everyone what we have done to ourselves. But I think we need to apply some analysis and attention now in order to ascertain that situation, and I am frank to say I think we have crossed the danger point and are now in the zone where our leadership ability is being eroded and undermined.

The various cuts have very detrimental effects on our ability to conduct an effective foreign policy. It would be one thing if people were saying we want a little America, something with which I do not agree. But if they say we are going to have a little America and we are going to shrink back from the responsibilities and, therefore, we are going to shrink resources, that at least would be a consistent position.

But to articulate a rhetorical position in terms of America being the world leader and playing the first and foremost role in exercising international responsibilities, and then have a huge gap between that statement and the resources with which to carry out those responsibilities, is illogical and inconsistent.

The United States now is the largest debtor at the United Nations. As the Washington Post put it in a recent editorial, we are the "global deadbeat." We are so far behind in paying our assessments to some of the international financial institutions that our arrearages exceed our scheduled annual payments. We are, indeed, exasperating and disappointing our friends and allies who desire and support American leadership. They desire and support American leadership. But we continually dictate ever longer lists of demands and provide ever shorter resources with which to carry them out.

Aid to the poorest countries has been reduced by nearly 30 percent from last